4 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR contains a discussion of existing conditions, thresholds above which an impact is considered significant, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation. Issues evaluated in these sections consist of a full range of potential environmental topics originally identified for review in the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft EIR. Appendix A contains a copy of the NOP and comments received on the NOP. Each of sections 4.1 through 4.12 of this Draft EIR are organized into the following major components:

- **Existing Conditions:** This subsection presents the existing regional and local environmental conditions relevant to the consideration of project impacts, as described below. The applicable regulatory framework, plans, and policies, under which the proposed project would be implemented, are also discussed in the Environmental Setting component of each section.

- **Thresholds of Significance:** This subsection presents the criteria used to define significant effects on the environment. The criteria are expressed as thresholds, above which the project would have a significant effect on the environment. Thresholds may be quantitative or qualitative, or may be based on agency standards, or legislative or regulatory requirements as related to the impact analysis.

- **Environmental Impacts:** This subsection discusses potential significant effects of the proposed project on the environment, based on whether it exceeds expressed thresholds. Project impacts are numbered sequentially in each section throughout the section. For instance, impacts in Section 4.3 are numbered Impact 4.3-1, Impact 4.3-2, Impact 4.3-3, and so on. A bold font impact statement precedes the discussion of each impact and provides the summary of each impact and its level of significance. The discussion that follows the impact statement includes information to support the stated conclusion. Where appropriate, the impact analysis describes the project-related impacts anticipated for the single-level and stacked options and budgeted and maximum inmate capacity conditions at SQSP.

- **Mitigation Measures:** This subsection provides mitigation measures to reduce significant or potentially significant effects of the proposed project to the extent feasible. The State CEQA guidelines (§15370) defines mitigation as:

  a. avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;

  b. minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of magnitude of the action and its implementation;

  c. rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;

  d. reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operation during the life of the action; and

  e. compensating for the impacts by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

The mitigation measures are registered numerically, corresponding to the impact being addressed. For example, Impact 4.3-3 would be mitigated with Mitigation 4.3-3.

- **Level of Significance after Mitigation:** This subsection describes the status of all significant impacts following application of mitigation measures. Either the impact would be reduced to a level below the significance threshold (mitigated to a less than significant level) or it would be concluded that feasible mitigation is not available or is insufficient to reduce an impact to less than significant. This would be a "significant unavoidable effect on the environment."

As described in the project description, this Draft EIR addresses the environmental impacts of constructing and operating the CIC either under the single level design option or the stacked design option. These design options would provide the same facilities, number of beds, and programs; however, the footprint of facility occupation would vary under each option. In general, the single level design option would have a larger footprint that would result in the demolition and removal of a greater number of buildings (i.e., existing prison housing and schoolhouse) compared to the stacked design option. However, the compressed footprint of the stacked design option would require the construction of taller more prominent SQSP staff housing units on the project site.

Where appropriate and relevant, the analysis in the subsections of Chapter 4, (i.e., water supply, cultural resources) identifies the differences in impacts that would be anticipated to occur with implementation of the project under 4 conditions: budgeted inmate capacity (5,763 inmates), maximum design inmate capacity (7,380 inmates), single level design option, and stacked design option. Table 4-1 identifies the issue areas for which separate discussions of project conditions is provided.

Table 4-1
Project Condition Discussion by Environmental Topic

Environmental Topic	Single Level/ Stacked Design Options	Budgeted Capacity/Maximum Design Capacity
Visual Resources	•	
Land Use and Planning	•	
Cultural Resources	•	
Employment, Population and Housing		•
Public Services and Utilities *		•
Transportation and Traffic		•
* For certain relevant services (i.e., water and wastewater)		